

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Jared B. Floyd et al.

Application No.: 10/766,707

Confirmation No.: 3818

Filed: January 28, 2004

Art Unit: 3737

For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR ASSISTING
IN POSITIONING AND/OR GUIDING
MEDICAL DEVICES

Examiner: P. S. Mehta

SUPPLEMENTAL INTERVIEW SUMMARY

MS AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

APPLICANT'S RECORD UNDER § 713.04 OF INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER

In addition to the interview summary submitted with the response dated January 30, 2009, Applicant provides the present supplemental interview summary to address inaccuracies in Examiner's summary mailed on February 03, 2009.


Applicant does not concur with the substance of the Examiner's summary of the interview, and in particular disputes the Examiner's statement that Applicant "admits that Pruter (614) discloses a slidably coupled latch." Examiner's statement stems from confusion which occurred during the interview regarding whether Pruter (6,296,614), or Pruter (7,087,024) was being discussed. Applicant notes that this clarification was made during the

interview. Pruter (614) clearly does not disclose a slidably coupled latch.¹ Applicant did state that the Pruter (024) does appear to have a component which slides.²

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 65744/P016US/10316060, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw, during the pendency of this Application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Dated: February 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
R. Ross Viguet
Registration No.: 42,203
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-8185
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

¹ This point is set forth in detail within Applicant's February 03, 2009 response.

² However, Applicant notes that Pruter (024) does not teach a slidably coupled latch, at least because the sliding component does not latch. Further, Pruter (024) fails to teach other limitations of the present claims at least because of the reasons which were set forth in Applicant's October 18, 2007 response. Examiner appeared to agree with Examiner's October 18, 2007 response as evidenced by the withdrawal of the rejection.